

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-84 are pending in the above-identified patent application.

The Examiner has finally rejected claims 1, 32, 33, 35-46, 77, 78 and 80-84 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang et al. U.S. Patent 6,448,820. Claims 34 and 79 have been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Wang in view of Linebarger et al. U.S. Patent 6,141,394. Each of claims 2-31 and 47-76 has been objected to as depending from a rejected based claim, but allowable subject matter has been indicated.

The Examiner has also objected to certain language in claims 1-3 and 46-48.

Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-31 and 47-76 and hereby expressly reserves the right to rewrite any one or more of claims 2-31 and 47-76 in independent form should the base claims ultimately not be allowed.

Applicant has proposed amending claims 1-3 and 46-48 in order to more particularly define the invention. The Examiner's rejections and objection are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's Reply to the  
Objection to Claims 1-3 and 46-48

The Examiner has objected to certain language in claims 1-3 and 46-48. Specifically, the Examiner has objected to the use of "at least one of said at least one of" with regard to the claimed "component." The Examiner suggested deleting the first occurrence of "at least one of" in each instance where the objectionable phrase occurred. This objection is respectfully traversed.

The claims in question define "at least one component." They further define at least one of the components in that group of at least one component as having

certain characteristics. Applicant is concerned that if the Examiner's suggestion is adopted, then the definition of "said at least one component" as having certain characteristics might be interpreted to mean that all of the components in the group referred to as "said at least one component" have those characteristics, when in fact all applicant means is that at least one component in the group referred to as "said at least one component" has those characteristics. Thus, the Examiner's suggestion might narrow the scope of applicant's claims.

Accordingly, to address the Examiner's concerns regarding clarity without adopting the Examiner's suggested amendments, applicant has proposed amending claims 1-3 and 46-48 to refer to "one or more of said at least one" instead of "at least one of said at least one." Applicant respectfully submits that this alternative amendment addresses the Examiner's concern without narrowing the scope of applicant's claims.\* Accordingly, these amendments should be entered and the objection to claims 1-3 and 46-48 should be withdrawn.

Applicant's Reply to the  
Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 32, 33, 35-46, 77, 78 and 80-84 have been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang, and claims 34 and 79 have been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Wang in view of Linebarger. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Wang neither shows nor suggests a PLL on a PLD in which a component in the feedback path of the PLL is programmably connectable to other portions of the PLD so that PLL components can operate with non-PLL components of

---

\* For those reasons, applicant respectfully submits that none of the amendments is a narrowing amendment under the doctrine of Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 535 U.S. 722, 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002), and related cases.

the PLD. As explained further in the allowable dependent claims, that would allow (1) a PLL component to be used elsewhere on the PLD when it otherwise would be idle because the PLL is not being used in the user logic design of the PLD, or (2) a component elsewhere on the PLD to be substituted for a component in the feedback path of the PLL. Because Wang does not show such a PLL, Wang also does not show a PLD incorporating such a PLL.

Wang shows a phase-frequency detector (PFD) having  $m$  states. The PFD may be used in a PLL or in a delay-locked loop (DLL). The only reason that there is any reference in Wang to a PLD is that the PLL or DLL (loop circuit) may be incorporated into a PLD, which in turn may be incorporated into a digital system. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Wang of making PLL components connectable to other portions of the PLD for operation of PLL components with non-PLL components.

The Examiner originally pointed to, and continues to point to, FIG. 1 of Wang, and particularly to element 121 of FIG. 1, as providing the missing disclosure. Applicant respectfully disagrees. FIG. 1 shows a digital system including a processing unit coupled to memory and input/output (I/O) circuitry. The processing unit is shown as incorporating a PLD (121). The PLD has optional connections to the memory and I/O circuitry of the processing unit outside the PLD. While Wang also discloses that the PLD includes a PLL and PLL components, there is no disclosure in FIG. 1 of Wang, or anywhere else in Wang, that the PLL components are programmably connectable to other portions or components of the PLD so that PLL components can operate with those other portions or components as described above.

Wang's optional connections of the PLD to components outside the PLD are completely irrelevant to the optional connection of PLL components inside the PLD to other portions of the PLD for the operation of PLL components with other PLD components as described above.

Linebarger also lacks any disclosure or suggestion of this feature, nor does the Examiner rely on Linebarger for this feature.

Although applicant raised the foregoing distinction in the previous Reply to Office Action, the Examiner did not address applicant's arguments in the final Office Action. The Examiner simply restated the rejection with no new explanation or responding argument. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the foregoing distinction, claims 1, 32-46 and 77-84 are patentable over both Wang and Linebarger.

This Amendment Should Be Entered

Although a final rejection has been made in the above-identified patent application, this amendment should be entered. The only amendments proposed herein are directed to matters of form raised by the Examiner in the final Office Action (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)). Those amendments, coupled with the foregoing argument distinguishing the references, should place the above-identified patent application in condition for allowance.


Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, applicant respectfully submits that the above-identified patent application, if amended as proposed, would be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration, entry of the proposed



amendments and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jeffrey H. Ingerman  
Reg. No. 31,069  
Attorney for Applicant  
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 36981  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020-1105  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Mail Stop AF, Hon. Commissioner for Patents,  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on February 1, 2005

Lillian Garcia  
Name of Person Signing Certificate

Lillian Garcia  
Signature of Person Signing Certificate

February 1, 2005  
Date of Signature